



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,731	12/08/2004	Claude Chapel	PF020064	6035
Joseph S Tripoli Thomson Licensing Inc Patent Operations P O Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312				
7590 04/15/2008				
EXAMINER				
RUTKOWSKI, JEFFREY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2619				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,731

Applicant(s)

CHAPEL ET AL.

Examiner

JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI

Art Unit

2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 3, 5 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes et al. (US Pat 6,647,015), hereinafter referred to as Malkemes, in view of Edson (US Pat 6,526,581)
3. For **claims 1 and 10**, Malkemes teaches a gateway **104** (communications device) that has connections to external satellite, Plain Old Telephone Service (POTS) and cable television sources [figure 1]. Figure 1 also shows a radio network (local area network) is used to facilitate communications between internal peripheral devices (i.e. personal computer, television) to the gateway **104** via radio network. Malkemes' invention uses a radio section **238** and gateway logic **240** [figure 2] (plurality of means for establishing connections) to deliver requested television programming and data services to the peripheral devices [col. 3 lines 24-38].
4. Malkemes teaches a gateway firewall **210** is used to prevent unauthorized access to the local network from external sources [col. 5 lines 5-10]. Malkemes does not teach the firewall is used to filter information. Edson teaches a firewall module (means for controlling) that provides network level protection and application level protection. Edson's firewall provides application level protection by scanning incoming packets and blocking (discarding) packets that contain

viruses (information not requested by a peripheral) [**col. 9 lines 35-50**]. The blocking of viruses is essentially the same as discarding information not requested by a peripheral because when information is requested by a peripheral there is an expectation that the information received will only include the requested content and not any additional information, such as a virus. The blocking of viruses also results in a reduction of bandwidth occupancy by preventing application code from entering the network that could cause a network device to be used as a “zombie” in a Denial of Service (DoS) attack. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Edson’s firewall in Malkemes’ invention to guard against code based (viruses) attacks.

5. For **claim 3**, the combination of Malkemes and Edson suggests using a firewall (filtering means) to perform demultiplexing operations [**Edson, figure 2**].
6. For **claim 5**, the combination of Malkemes and Edson disclose a firewall (filtering means) that performs packet filtering at network and application level [**Edson, col. 9 lines 35-50**].
7. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Edson, as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Kubota et al. (US Pat 6,353,613), hereinafter known as Kubota.
8. The combination of Malkemes and Edson does not teach a means for updating or a means for inserting. Kubota teaches the means for updating signalization tables by disclosing a controller unit **25** generates additional Program Specific Information (PSI) and Service Information (SI) on respective programs based upon packet identifier (PID). The controller **25** then generates a Program Map Table showing the PID values of the audio and video data [**col. 7**

lines 17-34] (means for updating signalization tables comprised in the incoming data). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Kubota's PMT table in Malkemes' invention to list all the PIDs for packets containing elements of a particular program.

9. Kubota also teaches the means for inserting modified signalization table limitation absent from the teachings of Horie by disclosing the controller **25** also packets and outputs the generated PMT table [**col. 7 lines 17-34**] (means for inserting the modified signalization tables in the stream sent to the local area network). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to packet and transmit the PMT table according to Kubota to allow other devices to locate the respective video and audio information.

10. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Edson, as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Hoffberg (US Pat 6,850,252).

11. For **claim 6**, the combination of Malkemes and Edson does not teach a means to guarantee copy protection. Hoffberg teaches an intelligent electronic appliance [**abstract**] that can be used to aid in copy protection, serial copy management and a pay-per-view royalty collection system [**col. 160 lines 8-11**]. The copy protection is provided via anti-copy encryption [**col. 170 lines 20-30**] (wherein it has means to guarantee a copy protection of the data coming from the external source).

12. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use an intelligent device with copy protection functionality in Horie's invention to keep users from pirating copyrighted materials.

13. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Edson, as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Horie et al. (US Pat 6,968,376), hereinafter known as Horie.

14. For **claim 7**, the combination of Malkemes teaches the use of a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) [**Malkemes, col. 1 lines 3-35**] and a copper network [**Edson, figure 1**] to connect internal peripherals to a gateway. The combination of Malkemes and Edson does not teach connecting devices via IEEE 1394 interface. Horie teaches an IEEE 1394 interface that home devices can use to communicate with a home gateway apparatus [**col. 4 lines 16-27 and figure 1**]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a IEEE 1394 interface in Malkemes' invention to provide a high speed interconnection mechanism.

15. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Edson, as applied to **claim 1** above, and further in view of Movshovich et al. (US Pat 6,359,911), hereinafter known as Movshovich.

16. For **claim 8**, the combination of Malkemes and Edson does not teach the use of DVB or DSS. Movshovich discloses the use of the DVB and the DSS standard [**col. 11 lines 46-58**] (wherein it is intended to generate a data stream on the local area network compliant with DVB or DSS standard). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the DVB or DSS standard in Malkemes' invention to support transmissions from satellite and television stations.

17. **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Edson and Karol et al. (US Pat 6,628,617), hereinafter known as Karol.

18. For **claim 9**, Malkemes teaches a gateway **104** (communications device) that has connections to satellite, Plain Old Telephone Service (POTS) and cable television data external data sources [**figure 1**]. Figure 1 also shows a radio network (local area network) is used to facilitate communications between internal peripheral devices (i.e. personal computer, television) to the gateway **104** via radio network. Malkemes' system also uses a gateway to connect and internal network to an external network.

19. The combination of Malkemes and Edson discloses a gateway module that performs the functions as disclosed in **claim 1**. The rejection of **claim 1** addresses the motivation to combine Malkemes' and Edson's inventions.

20. Malkemes' gateway module is a standalone device. Malkemes does not teach a gateway module that is distributed amongst certain peripherals of a network. . Karol teaches that gateway functionality could be implemented as a software module by endpoints [**col. 17 line 36**] (being distributed among some peripherals, called gateway modules). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use software gateway modules in Malkemes' invention to allow for the extension of a software to system.

21. The combination of Malkemes and Karol teaches the endpoints include regular Personal Computers (PC) running a commercially available operating system [**Karol, col. 17 lines 37-42**] (means for managing). The combination of Malkemes and Karol also teach Connection Oriented (CO) capabilities are implemented by the operating system running RSVP hooks. The applications running in the PC will assume the connectionless (CL) mode of operation [**Karol, col. 17 lines 40-42**] (enabling means).

22. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes in view of Edson, as applied to **claim 10** above, and further in view of Karol.

23. For **claim 11**, the combination of Malkemes and Edson does not teach the use of a computer program product. Karol teaches gateway functionality could be implemented as a software module by endpoints [col. 17 line 36]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use software gateway modules in Malkemes' invention to allow for the extension of a software system.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-11** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2619

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI whose telephone number is (571)270-1215. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey M Rutkowski
Patent Examiner
04/01/2008

/Hassan Kizou/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619